



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ing to their denomination, and their letter kept in custody for any future need, and of those who, from time to time, shall come into possession of a religious experience through conversion. In the admission of converts, permission shall be given to enrol under whichever name the individual may desire, care having been taken to allow for the intelligent satisfaction of the conscience. In the case of the ordinance of baptism, provision shall be made for its administration according to the desire of the candidate and by such person as shall be in full sympathy with the act.

Letters of dismissal shall bear the name of the federation and shall recommend the individual to the denomination desired. Any having joined the federation shall be dismissed as from the federation.

ART. 4. The minister shall be a regularly ordained clergyman, recognized in the circles of an evangelical church having general recognition in this state; said minister shall be expected to continue his association with his own body, but in his ministrations to this federation shall recognize and live up to the basis on which it is established. He shall be the choice of a two-thirds vote of a quorum at a specially called meeting of the church.

ART. 5. The building shall be turned over to the use of the federation and shall be kept in repair by the organization during the continua-

tion of the federation. The property as such shall, for the time, remain in the hands of the present trustees of the Baptist church.

ART. 6. The officers of this federation shall be the pastor, ex officio, a clerk and treasurer, and three deacons which, with two other members to be chosen by a majority of the congregation shall constitute an executive committee and shall represent as nearly as possible the personnel of the federation.

ART. 7. The general expenses, care of building, and running expenses of service shall be borne by the federation as such and without any reference to any past ratio.

ART. 8. Four regular collections shall be taken during the year for missionary purposes and shall be divided equally between the two federated churches. Any special collection may be taken only by consent of the congregation.

ART. 9. If for any purpose either or any denomination forming a part of this federation desires a meeting for its own particular purpose, such meeting may be held provided it does not interfere with the regular services of the federation.

ART. 10. This federation shall be in effect for at least two years.

ART. 11. This constitution may be changed or amended by a two-thirds vote of a special meeting called for that purpose.

## CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS

### IV

## POLITICS AND THE REFORMATION

THOMAS C. HALL, D.D.

Professor of Christian Ethics in Union Theological Seminary

The Reformation was a composite movement in which there were many complex and even contradictory elements. The political interests were seldom sharply defined or even clearly

understood. The sweep that Protestantism made of the northern free cities is one of the most interesting and instructive facts in the movement. Yet it is hasty, for that reason, to

stamp the Reformation as a wholly "middle class" movement. We see in fact almost better reason for making it a geographical matter, seeing that the farther away from Rome the more thoroughgoing was the change. Scandinavia became Protestant to a man. North Germany was overwhelmingly Protestant, while South Germany and Austria remained substantially under the power of the Papacy. The Reformation was, however, neither wholly a class nor a geographical matter. It was in part the spiritual expression of the rise of new nationality. It incarnated the sense of an individual approach to God apart from the central spiritual autocracy. The theoretical questions of the relation of the church to the state raised by Marsilius de Padua, Archbishop Richard Fitz-Ralph, Wiclif, as well as by Machiavelli and Dante had now to be translated into actual practice. And a situation emerged which in some sense must be regarded as profoundly unfortunate. In Luther's letter to the princes of Germany he calls upon them to reconstitute the church. Not indeed that he recognized the "worldly" sword as higher than the "spiritual" sword, but because in 1520 he wished the whole difference swept away. All men were priests to God, and the whole hierarchy was a matter of order and arrangement, and had become a usurpation of the rights and duties belonging to all Christians. Luther therefore attacked the "three walls" by which this usurpation prevented the reorganization of Christendom, and called upon the aristocracy of Germany and the "hopeful young blood" that had come to the imperial dignity

(Charles V) to take the work in hand. In this early period he still hoped for a "right free" council; but as that hope lost its power Luther increasingly relied upon the strong support given him by the Elector, and turned with an instinctively increasing emphasis upon the supremacy of the state. Luther was a man of action who knew how to defend his activity by cogent intellectual analysis. At the same time he most evidently had no matured and self-consistent political theory. He looked to the temporal power to protect the gospel and suppress heresy, but constantly assumed that only deliberate wickedness and an obstinate blindness could fail to see and recognize the gospel when once proclaimed. And his faith in any type of political supremacy depended upon the readiness shown to accept his gospel. Probably no astuteness on the part of Luther, and no theory, however profoundly right, could have saved the situation. Nevertheless the distractions of the Thirty Years' War, the passive and often ignoble attitude of the Lutheran state churches, and the ready subserviency of the church to the central secular authority are, in part at least, to be traced to Luther's attitude. The young reformation movements trusted to selfish secular leaders, and the reed they leaned upon pierced their hands. This was true alike in Scandinavia and in Germany. Luther's own doctrine grew out of political expediency, as is seen in the wavering outlines of his theory of the relation of church and state. He himself would have been the first to rebel, and maintain his spiritual independence, had he found less faithful allies than he did. Once,

however, the church had committed her fortunes unreservedly to the state she became again a faithful pillar of the existing order, even when that order was divisive tyranny and its policy one of contemptible subordination of national to petty dynastic interests.

Luther appealed to the Scriptures to obtain freedom for faith, and to the protectorate of Constantine to show that the secular power could call a council; but in so doing he re-established the tyranny of the written word and the political state over men's minds. Everyone was indeed bound by the word of Scripture, but the interpretation was left in the hands of a state church wholly dependent upon the secular authority.

It was no wonder that many of the more radical Anabaptists, so called, reached other opinions on the basis of the same open Bible. Most of these sects were as narrow literalists as Luther at his worst, and few of them rose to the heights of personal spiritual freedom that marked Luther at his best. At the same time, it is a most shameful pity that the Reformation had no room for some of its own most noble children. In very various degrees they struggled for individualism, both in interpretation of the Bible and in their relations to the state. The fanaticism so easily charged against them was often as much a result of their treatment as the cause of it. They should certainly have had their hearing and their chance. Nevertheless careful examination of the various political theories of the so-called Anabaptists fails to reveal any one of them holding anything like a modern and fairly

self-consistent theory of the relation of the church to the state. To represent them as "socialists" or "revolutionary communists" or as "forerunners of the modern Protestantism" is to read into them opinions and interests generally quite strange and foreign to their world.

So far as what are called the Anabaptists had anything in common, it was rebellion against an external ecclesiastical authority, and a constant insistence upon the sole authority of the written word. Their attitude toward the secular authority varied much as they found it for or against Rome. When the state persecuted them they took generally the attitude of the early church and denounced the state as they denounced Rome as the Anti-Christ.

The literal interpretation of the Scriptures made most of them despondent with regard to both church and state, and they looked for the speedy coming of Christ in person. Hence any political theory was both unnecessary and unrevealed. It is easy to pick out sayings and phrases from these radical dissenters, that seem to give them a modern look. But in most cases an examination of the context shows that it is a misuse of these phrases to make them reflect any attitude that resembles our modern longing for democracy. Even the demand for religious toleration was a result of their own sufferings, and was often based only on the claim that the persecuted minority had possession of the truth rather than upon any abstract faith in mental freedom.

Of systematic political or social thinking apart from its religious bearings, and its relation to the saving of

individual souls, there is hardly any trace. The speculations concern quite other matters than a political theory, or a philosophy of society. To go directly to the writings of the so-called Anabaptists and read them in connection with the theology of the day will do much to correct the false impressions abroad about these much misunderstood writings.

The case is otherwise when we come to Zwingli and Calvin. Zwingli grew up in the free, or relatively free, atmosphere of Humanism. The Pope favored him and protected him as a humanist, because it was readily seen that Rome could make her peace with Humanism. Rome did not early realize that in many ways Zwingli was the very incarnation of that new national feeling which was to be Rome's most deadly foe. Nor did Rome recognize at first the fact that the freedom of Humanism was in Zwingli ultimately entirely subordinate to the religious and almost exclusive principle of God's absolute sovereignty.

The political and social thinking of the Reformed party in Europe was, like that of the Lutherans, under the influence of the profound faith in the external authority of the Bible. But Zwingli and Calvin took the Old Testament more seriously than did either Luther or Melancthon. Hence the theocracy of the Old Testament became in a distinct sense an authoritative ideal. Professors Max Webber and Ernst Troeltsch (Heidelberg) see in the spirit of Calvinism a main support of modern capitalism. They call attention to the "puritanic asceticism" and self-control which makes economic saving and thrifty frugality important

virtues, while socialist interpretation, like that of Bax and others, sees in Calvinism the religious spirit produced by a middle class trading interest. Both these points of view are one-sided interpretations. Calvinism reached its purest expression in the Highlands of Scotland and the Southern States of North America, where feudalism and slavery and a patriarchal outlook upon life found welcome shelter in the authority of the Old Testament. The rise of industrial capitalism displaced Calvinism in England and is rapidly undermining it in southern Scotland. It is not fair to trace to Calvinism what is much more closely connected with the discovery of coal. It is equally unhistorical to trace the rise of democracy to Calvinism. Here again republicanism rather than democracy is the form in which Calvinism did its social and political thinking. No doubt the conception of a sovereign God to whom immediate appeal can be made against all tyranny has been a tremendous factor in the thinking of a struggling minority. At the same time it has also its tendency to suppress moral autonomy and to place the notion of power rather than even justice in the center of political thinking. Calvinism did not make Scotch Presbyterianism at the time of the Westminster Assembly either politically wise or just. In spite of Professor Troeltsch's denials there remain in Calvinistic thinking many memories of the Roman Catholic outlook upon life with its external authority, its underestimate of the world, its legalism, and its centralized government. The theocracy of Calvin was a distinctly ecclesiastical theocracy.

Elders are not laymen, and in the Presbyterian theocracy the laymen have no direct power. The church elects representatives who are straightway ordained to the ruling ministry, either as deacons or as elders. It is a constitutional authority, indeed, with the word of God written as the fundamental law. But on the other hand the courts that interpret the law are purely ministerial courts. It is a modern corruption of the Calvinistic theocracy that makes elders "laymen."

To some degree, at least, it was the centralizing power of Calvinism that made it a bulwark of Protestantism. But even more than that the appeal to the fighting record of the Old Testament theocracy stirred the blood of the men who resisted Rome in arms. It is dangerous to overestimate the effectiveness of that resistance. Hungary and France were lost. The north of Italy and the Rhine provinces were swept again into the Roman lap. The Forest Cantons, Belgium, and Austria remained at the end of the struggle Roman Catholic. England remained far more Roman Catholic than at times has been acknowledged, as the rise of the High Church party has revealed. Bavaria, Württemberg, Saxony, and Baden Baden were left with strong leanings to Roman Catholicism so that at the Peace of Westphalia (1648) Rome entered upon the task of the reorganization of her life with much ground recovered that at one time seemed hopelessly gone.

Nor can we acquit Protestantism of political failures and lack of substantial faith in her own most precious gift to men—freedom to think. It

was not Lutheranism nor yet Calvinism that in Germany and Holland fought most bravely for freedom of scientific research and intellectual autonomy. It was the Rationalism that had its roots in the old Humanism. It was in the life of the university that a new Protestantism with larger vision and profounder faith took root. Rousseau, Voltaire, and Socinus are not names to conjure with in religious Protestant circles, but they did more to set the political and social thinking of Protestantism free from the trammels of a Roman Catholic theology and the outward authority of a book than religious leaders are ever likely to acknowledge.

The political and social thinking of classic Protestantism was dominated from the beginning by a theological interest. Men desired political institutions in which a "true" as over against a "false" theological system could live and thrive. To both Luther and Calvin correct doctrine was essential for the world's salvation, and all the political and social arrangements of men were to be subordinated to the protection and extension of the truth as set forth in a theology. Could classic Protestantism have agreed upon its system of doctrine it might have become as fatal a barrier to intellectual autonomy as was ever the Papacy itself. Happily it found protection under various forms of political organization and so never could commit its life to any one form. In Switzerland, Holland, England, Scandinavia, etc., Protestantism combined with the political thought of its age, and discovered as numerous intellectual apologies for the politics it found as there were separate political situations, so

that when Hugo Grotius at last took up the task of relating Protestantism to its international and political environment he really entered upon a new and unworked field.

The practical effect of Protestantism can hardly be overestimated. It gave the spiritual energy without which our new civilization is well-nigh unthinkable. It forced men by its challenge of the existing authority to reflect seriously upon all authority. It bravely nurtured the spirit of restless discontent, and strengthened men for their struggle with a wornout feudalism and an exhausted political ideal. It gave men confidence in vital righteousness, and set men to work on national areas. Moreover, it compelled the Roman hierarchy to insist upon reform along all lines of life, and in a measure indicated the lines of the needed reformation.

Nevertheless Protestantism cannot be regarded as having given the world a new social ideal or as having established a political platform for the one it so vigorously attacked. Even when we include in Protestantism the children of Humanism like Hobbes, Rousseau, Comte, Bentham, and later ones of the same type, he must still realize that the political and social work of Protestantism was mainly negative and its approaches to the constructive task were tentative and even timid.

Why was this the case? The answer is not to be given in a word, for only a realization of the complexity and confusion of the situation enables us to give any answer at all. The constant assumption of both Catholicism and Protestantism alike was that all ecclesi-

astical and political forms were given on the authority of religious revelation. The contention of Catholicism was that this religious revelation was the possession and monopoly of the sacramental hierarchy; the contention of Protestantism, on the other hand, was that it was only contained in the Bible. But all agreed that the last appeal was to a religious revelation. To this authority in the last analysis all political and social theory had to bow. Now unfortunately the religious tradition seemed to sanction a very wide range of differing ecclesiastical and political tradition. Luther's common-sense led him to wish as little outward change in the forms of both church and political government as possible, so long as spiritual freedom was encouraged and practical righteousness was advanced. Calvinism so completely fixed its attention upon the restoration of a true church that political forms were of secondary consideration. And well they might be, for in theory the church became all in all. The theocracy was central, the political machinery was an administrative detail. This too was substantially the attitude of Bucer, to whom the political machinery of England, Germany, and Switzerland seemed completely adequate so long only as the secular authority protected, and in spiritual matters obeyed, the true church established upon the word of God. Moreover, what was in fact "spiritual" and what was "secular" only the church herself could discover and maintain.

Thus it came about that in the dependence of the several Protestant bodies upon secular political organizations the temptation to justify from

Scripture the forms men were accustomed to was very great. From the same religious revelation men cogently defended the divine right of kings to do any wrong, and the divine right of revolution and regicide. For the Catholicism of the Middle Ages the close and high reasoning of Aristotle on political life had entered into the thinking of the schoolmen and formed a part of the religious tradition. Melancthon had clumsily to discover all the things Aristotle had really taught him in the pages of Deuteronomy and Paul. And so all along the line the old authority of tradition dogged the steps of the Reformers as they strove to reconstitute church and state. No wonder their success was questionable, and their blunders dramatic and serious. These confusions led to the dreary compromise in Germany that the religion of the prince should be the religion of the people, and in England to all the bloody confusion of the Commonwealth and the Restoration. It gave France

over to Henry, who thought a kingdom worth a mass or two; and left men's minds distracted and divided between the verdicts of their common-sense and political instinct and their submission to the letter of Holy Writ.

In fact, Protestantism had no such well-defined and intellectually defensible position as had the centralized feudalism of Rome. Her instincts and purposes were right. Her face was toward the future and freedom. But she still was hampered by external authority and was groping in the half-darknesses of a false apologetic. Her life is still shadowed over by the false assumptions of Roman Catholic theology which she has never shaken off, and her way is still much lost amid the traditions in political and social thinking inherited from Rome. But the new world has at last entered upon her view, and in a final article the attempt will be made to trace the lines along which a new Protestantism must reconstruct the life of the world.

---

## THE VALUE OF DRAMATICS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

---

AGNES MILLER  
New York City

---

Within the last few years the educational possibilities of the drama have been fully recognized in pedagogical circles. School after school has demonstrated the value of dramatic work in the judicious training of pupils for patriotic

or seasonal celebrations, pageants, plays, and the like. Some slight attempt has been made to utilize this so-called "play idea" in the Sunday school as well as the day school, and, indeed, considering the universal pedagogical principles which